

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. **If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, or believes that some or all of the claims are not in condition for allowance, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone Examiner Interview before any further actions on the merits.**

The applicants will now address each of the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action.

### Objections

The specification is objected to due to a misplacement of a reference sign description. In particular, the Examiner notes that EEPROM 16 is first described in connection with Figure 4, but is first shown in Figure 1, and recommends describing reference sign 16 with the initial description of Figure 1. (See Paper No. 120204, page 2.)

The applicants have amended the specification, as the Examiner recommended, to describe the EEPROM 16 in the initial description of Figure 1. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 11 and 20 are objected to because of minor informalities. These claims have been amended based on the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Accordingly, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 11-14, 16, 18, 20-24, 48, 49, 51, 52 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,652,930 ("the Teremy patent"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Since claims 23 and 24 have been canceled, this ground of rejection is moot with respect to these claims.

Independent claims 11, 16, 20 and 21, as amended, recite that an operator can manually change the luminous brightness or luminous color of (A) at least one display segment out of a plurality of display segments displayed on the display device (or the display section), or (B) the background of the display segments. In this way, the display device for a camera or the camera according to the claimed invention enables clear and simple display without providing an incompatible feeling to an operator (a photographer).

On the other hand, referring to Figure 3 for example, the Teremy patent discloses a panel 40 supporting multiple icons 56 and 58, and an in-line array 60 of alpha-numeric character generators 62. Each of the icons 56 and 58 is defined by one illumination element 63 and 64, respectively. Each character generator 62

employs a matrix 62 of illumination elements 66 and 68. Further, the illumination elements (OLEDs) 63, 64, 66 and 68 comprise organic electroluminescent material. The illumination elements in the Teremy patent may be provided in one or more groups of elements with the electroluminescent material. The electroluminescent material in each group can emit light in a color different from those of other groups.

However, the colors of the icons 56 and 58 and the character generators 62 in the Teremy patent are preselected -- that is, when the electroluminescent materials are constructed. Although the color of each icon or character generator may be chosen to be different from the colors of other display elements, the Teremy patent neither teaches, nor suggests, changing the color of at least one of the icons 56 and 58 and the character generators 62 manually by an operator. Further, the Teremy patent neither teaches, nor suggests, manually changing the color of the background. Furthermore, the Teremy patent neither teaches, nor suggests, manually changing the brightness of the icons 56 and 58 or of the character generators 62.

In view of the foregoing, independent claims 11, 16, 20 and 21, as amended, are not anticipated by the Teremy patent. Since claims 12-14 and 48 depend from claim 11, since claims 18, 49 and 51 depend from claim 16, since claims 52 and 54 depend from claim 20 and since claim 22 depends from claim 21, these claims are similarly not anticipated by the Teremy patent.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Teremy patent. The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to use electrically rewritable memory in the Teremy patent. Even assuming, arguendo, that this is true, it does not compensate for the deficiencies of the Teremy patent with respect to claim 16. Thus, claim 17 is not rendered obvious by the Teremy patent for at least the same reason as discussed above with respect to claim 16.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicants request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

March 14, 2005



John C. Pokotylo, Attorney  
Reg. No. 36,242  
Tel.: (732) 542-9070

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on **March 14, 2005** with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

  
John C. Pokotylo

36,242  
Reg. No.